

Appl. No. 09/768,956
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13249-US2
EUS/J/P/04-2070

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 10 and 12. Claims 10-14 remain pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner noted that certain claim language in claims 10 and 12 was not clearly understood. The Applicants have amended those claims to clarify the language as noted by the Examiner and, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 10-12 and 14 as being anticipated by Sen, *et al.* (US 6,708,034). The Applicants traverse the rejections.

Claims 10-12:

Claim 10 recites:

10. A method in a mobile terminal for providing support for internet protocol signaling, wherein the mobile terminal is connected to a local user's terminal equipment and to a radio network, the method comprising the steps of:

terminating a resource reservation protocol message sent from the local user's terminal equipment;

determining, based on parameters contained in the resource reservation protocol message, whether to create a new packet data protocol context or to modify an existing packet data protocol context; and

sending a request to create or modify the packet data protocol context through the radio network. (emphasis added)

Appl. No. 09/768,956
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13249-US2
EUS/J/P/04-2070

Not only does Sen not disclose a method comprising the steps recited in claim 10, but fails to even disclose performing any similar steps in a mobile terminal, as recited in the preamble of claim 10. This can be noted based on the Examiner's assertion that the second step recited in claim 10 is taught by Sen at col. 5, lines 31-66, which actually describes an "RSVP-agent in the wireless network node (e.g., GGSN)."

Thus, whereas Sen fails to disclose the steps recited in claim 10 *performed within a mobile terminal*, Sen fails to anticipate claim 10. Furthermore, whereas claims 11-12 are dependent from claim 10, and include the limitations thereof, those claims are also not anticipated by Sen.

Claim 14:

The Examiner also rejected claim 14 as being anticipated by Sen. Claim 14 recites:

14. A mobile terminal comprising:
a first interface to a local user's terminal equipment;
a second interface to a radio network;
a terminating unit for terminating resource reservation protocol; and
a translation unit for transforming a resource reservation protocol message into a packet data protocol message and vice versa. (emphasis added)

The Examiner asserts that Sen discloses "a translation unit for transforming a resource reservation protocol message into a packet data protocol message and vice versa" at column 4, lines 22-27, and column 7, lines 6-7. The Applicants have reviewed the referenced portions of Sen and fail to see where the Examiner has identified a translation unit, within a mobile terminal, for transforming a resource reservation protocol (RSVP) message to a packet data protocol (PDP) message, and *vice versa*. At column 4, lines 22-27, Sen states that a mobile station has an operating system that is "capable of generating and interpreting RSVP messages," but fails to teach transforming such RSVP messages to PDP messages. Similarly, at column 7, lines 6-7,

Appl. No. 09/768,956
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13249-US2
EUS/J/P/04-2070

Sen states that "RSVP signaling is used to perform PDP sub-context activation," but fails to teach transforming an RSVP message to a PDP message. Accordingly, Sen fails to anticipate claim 14.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 13 as being unpatentable over Sen in view of Puuskari (US 6,728,208). The Applicants traverse the rejection.

Claim 13 recites:

13. A method for a gateway general packet radio service support node comprising the steps of:
including internet protocol quality of service information in packet data protocol context; and
transforming, by the gateway general packet radio service support node, quality of service related signaling according to an internet protocol into signaling according a resource reservation protocol, and vice versa.
(emphasis added)

In rejecting claim 13, the Examiner asserts that:

"[a]s per claim 13, Sen taught the invention as claimed for a gateway general packet radio service support node comprising the steps of:

transforming, by the gateway general packet radio service support node, quality of service related signaling according to an internet protocol into signaling according a resource reservation protocol, and vice versa. (col. 5, lines 31-49).

The Applicants have reviewed the referenced portion of Sen and fail to see where the Examiner has identified any teaching relating to transforming quality of service related signaling according to an internet protocol into signaling according a resource reservation protocol, and *vice versa*. The Applicants must respectfully request that the Examiner specifically identify how Sen discloses Applicants' claimed invention, or withdraw the rejection.

Appl. No. 08/768,956
Amdt. Dated August 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P13249-US2
EUS/J/P/04-2070

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 10-14.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: August 3, 2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com